

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action issued on February 15, 2007. Applicants' representative would like to thank Examiner Avellino for the courtesy he extended during the telephone interview conducted on June 5, 2007.

By the foregoing amendments, Applicants have amended the original claims along the lines discussed during the telephone interview. Specifically, Applicants have changed "404 error" to "HTTP 404 error" in Claims 40, 47 and 57, and have amended each of the independent claims to add limitations related to the use of a hierarchy. Applicants have also revised several dependent claims, and have added several new dependent claims. All of the claim amendments are fully supported by the originally filed specification.

As amended, the independent claims recite limitations that are not taught or suggested by Holzer, Messerly, Risley (U.S. Pat. 6,332,158) or Huntington (U.S. Pat. 7,162,698) (collectively "the applied references"), or by any combination of these references. For example, with respect to Claim 31, the applied references do not collectively teach or suggest the following feature in the context of the other limitations of the claim: "wherein the error processing server is capable of selecting the alternate object according to a predefined hierarchy of alternate object types such that selection priority is given to a first type of alternate object over at least a second type of alternate object."

With respect to Claim 43, the applied references do not collectively teach or suggest the following feature in the context of the other limitations of the claim: "wherein the error processing server selects the alternate web page using a hierarchy that specifies a preference for a first type of alternate web page over at least a second type of alternate web page."

With respect to Claim 54, the applied references do not collectively teach or suggest the following feature in the context of the other limitations of the claim: "wherein looking up the alternate URL comprises using a hierarchy of alternate object types to select the alternate URL, said hierarchy of alternate object types specifying a preference for a first alternate object type over at least a second alternate object type."

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the independent claims, and thus the dependent claims, are patentably distinct from the applied references.

Appl. No. : 10/634,633
Filed : August 5, 2003

Applicants also submit that the dependent claims, including those added by this Amendment, recite limitations that provide additional patentable distinctions over the applied references. As one example, new dependent Claim 73 states that “the system enables each user to specify the predefined hierarchy to control how alternate objects are selected for display.” The applied references do not suggest this feature.

By focusing on specific claims and claim limitations in the discussion above, Applicants do not imply that other claim limitations are disclosed or suggested by the references.

If any issues remain which can potentially be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record at this direct dial number of 949.721.2950.

Please charge any additional fees, including any additional fees for extension of time, or credit overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: June 15, 2007

By: /RJS38297/
Ronald J. Schoenbaum
Registration No. 38,297
Customer No. 20,995
949-721-2950

3454668/dns
022107